## 6.1 Transportation Technologies: Clean Cities/Alternative Fuels

State: Propo	sal ID <u>#</u>			_	
Project name:Category #:				_	
DOE requested amount \$:	Cost Share amount \$ Acceptable Propos	al Yes	1 Yes No		
GENERAL		Y	N	N/A	
1. Is the project located in an active, de	esignated Clean City?				
2. Is the local Clean Cities coalition a	partner?				
3. Is there a letter of support from the Clean Cities coalition?					
4. Are there separate proposals for each subject area?					
5. Is the amount requested within the f	funding limitations?				
6. Are letters of commitment attached	for all matching funds?				
7. Is the project period 24 months or le	ess?			_	
8. Is there a statement stating that a fin	nal report will be submitted?				
9. Is there a description of the status ar	nd results of previous grants?				
*	then explain the actions that were taken to	either r	ectify	or	
CATEGORY 1: Projects that promo	ote the acquisition of AFVs in "niche" m	arket fl	eets		
1. Is the proposal for \$100,000 or less	of <b>DOE funds</b> on light duty vehicles?				
2. Is the proposal for \$200,000 or less duty vehicles?	of <b>DOE funds</b> on medium to heavy				
3. Is the non-DOE cost share at least 3	3 1/3% of the total project?				
4. Is the DOE funding not more than 6	66 2/3% of the total project?				
5. If any of the cost share is Federal Fu contributing agency stating that their					
6. If PVE funds are used for cost share	e, are they Stripper Well funds?				

7.	Are fuel provider fleets in compliance with EPACT?		
8.	Is the proposal only for the incremental cost of the AFVs?		
9.	If bi-fuel or dual fuel AFV, is there a fuel use data collection and reporting plan included and information on refueling infrastructure?		
	any of the above were answered no, then explain the actions that were taken to squalify the proposal.	either rect	ify or
C	ATEGORY 2: Projects that develop AFV refueling infrastructure		
1.	Is the proposal for \$150,000 or less of <b>DOE funds</b> ?		
2.	Is the non-DOE cost share at least 33 1/3% of the total project and 50% of this amount in cash?		
3.	Is the DOE funding not more than 66 2/3% of the total project?		
4.	If any of the cost share is Federal Funds, is there a letter from the contributing agency stating that their funds may be used?		
5.	If PVE funds are used for cost share, are they Stripper Well funds?		
6.	Does the proposal include, fuel type, estimated fuel use, and the projected number of AFVs that will use the facility?		
7.	Is the fueling site identified, and a project implementation plan, a proposed construction schedule, a discussion of permitting requirements, and environmental assessments needs included?		
8.	Will the fueling site have public access provisions?		
9.	If proposal is for a billing system, is it a universal card and support station networking protocols already established for the region?		
	any of the above were answered no, then explain the actions that were taken to squalify the proposal.	either rect	ify or
	ATEGORY 3: Projects that deploy alternative fuels school buses		
1.	Is the proposal in the range of \$100,000 - \$200,000 or less of <b>DOE</b> funds?		
2.	Is the non-DOE cost share at least 20% of the total project with 25% of this amount in cash?		

3.	Is the DOE funding not more than 80% of the total project?
4.	If any of the cost share is Federal Funds, is there a letter from the contributing agency stating that their funds may be used?
5.	If PVE funds are used for cost share, are they Stripper Well funds?
6.	Does the project support DOE's Energy \$mart Schools initiative?
7.	Does the project focus on deployment rather than technology?
8.	Will the school buses have emissions certified engines from original equipment manufacturers.
	any of the above were answered no, then explain the actions that were taken to either rectify or qualify the proposal.
	ATEGORY 4: Projects that promote AFV training.  Is the proposal in the \$50,000 to \$70,000 range or less of DOE funds?
2.	Is the non-DOE cost share at least 50% of the total project with 50% of this amount in cash?
3.	Is the DOE funding not more than 50% of the total project?
4.	If any of the cost share is Federal Funds, is there a letter from the contributing agency stating that their funds may be used?
5.	If PVE funds are used for cost share, are they Stripper Well funds?
6.	Does the training facilitate the transition from conventional fuel to alternative fuel use in the nice market fleets?
7.	Are the deliverables defined in the proposal?
8.	Is the entity conducting the training identified and qualifications provided?
9.	Are a training syllabus, course objectives, and schedule for training included?
	any of the above were answered no, then explain the actions that were taken to either rectify or qualify the proposal.

## **CATEGORY 5: Clean Cities Coordinator positions**

1.	If the proposal is for a full-time coordinator, is the proposal for \$25,000 or less of <b>DOE funds</b> ?	_	_
2.	. If the proposal is for a part-time coordinator, is the proposal for \$15,000 or less of <b>DOE funds?</b>		_
3.	. Is the non-DOE cost share at least 50% of the total project with 50% of this amount in cash?		_
4.	. Is the DOE funding not more than 50% of the total project?		_
5.	. If any of the cost share is Federal Funds, is there a letter from the contributing agency stating that their funds may be used?		_
6.	. If PVE funds are used for cost share, are they Stripper Well funds?		_
7.	. Are the duties of the coordinator outlined?		_
8.	. Is this the first time that they have applied for funding a coordinator?		_
	f any of the above were answered no, then explain the actions that were taken to either rectify isqualify the proposal.	or	